

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are currently pending in the application. Claims 9 and 37 are hereby cancelled.

Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Claims 13, 22 and 30 stand objected to as each depending upon a rejected base claim. Each of these claims has been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable.

The remaining claims, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-21, 23-29, 31-36 and 38-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,869,679 (Szegda).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 10/12, 14-21, 23-29, 31-36 and 38-48 is requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiners Imas and Patel for the courtesies extended him at the interview on August 16, 2006.

During the interview, it was pointed out to the Examiners that Szegda does not teach or suggest a cooperating groove and bead, as recited in each of independent claims 41 and 44. These claims and their dependent claims are thus believed allowable.

It was pointed out to the Examiners that Szegda does not teach or suggest threads on a corresponding port having an effective diameter that is less than the inside effective diameter of the sealing portion, with the sealing portion in its first state, as recited in claim 9. This limitation has now been incorporated into claim 7. Szegda specifically teaches away from this dimensional relationship in the bridging paragraph between columns 2 and 3. The Examiners tentatively agreed that this claim would be allowable.

Claim 35 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 37, which likewise relates to a method that is not taught or suggested by Szegda's structure. This


added limitation corresponds to that in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 35 and its dependent claims are believed allowable.

It was pointed out to the Examiners that Szegda does not teach or suggest a sealing assembly and tubular fitting, each with axially oppositely facing shoulders, that abut to prevent separation of the sealing assembly and tubular fitting by relative axial movement in either direction. This limitation has been added to claims 27 and 34 to make these claims, and their dependent claims, allowable.

During the interview, the amendments to claim 21 were likewise discussed with the Examiners. It was tentatively agreed that this language would patentably distinguish over Szegda. The written description has been amended to have direct correspondence in language between the written description and amended claim. Accordingly, claim 21, and its dependent claims, are believed allowable.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the case are requested. The additional claim fee of \$600.00 is enclosed. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted

By: 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

Date: Nov 1, 2006

WOOD, PHILLIPS ET AL
500 W. Madison St., Ste. 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800